

# Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1864

Weekly National Intelligencer.

By GALE & SEATON.

JAMES C. WELLS, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

The subscription price of this paper for a year is Two Dollars, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 percent (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 3 percent (one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

No accounts being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1864.

## A CALM REVIEW OF OUR SITUATION.

In the midst of the martial sights and sounds which engage the attention of all eyes and ears there are perhaps but few who pause to consider in all their relations the elements of the great strife which is now rending the nation. And among those who assay a calm and philosophical analysis of these elements there is a wide diversity of opinion both as to the nature and combination of the agencies which have set this people at variance and as to the influences which can bring repose to the land.

The most fundamental point of difference in this regard arises in the matter of slavery, considered as the determining element in which the war originated, as it is certainly that which has given to the war the direction it has finally taken and the complexion it has finally assumed. The belligerent issue which was originally joined, for the defence of political principles embodied in the Constitution and the laws, has come to be complicated in the public mind with policies and theories of social reform which look not so much to a restoration of the Union as to a reconstruction of society at the South, or which look to a restoration of the Union only as the same shall be conditioned on the destruction of slavery. In this way it has come to pass that the war, which was originally political in its avowed objects, has assumed in the eyes of many the character of a war of pure ideas, in which motives of universal philanthropy and humanity have taken the place of those definite obligations which restrain as well as prompt the actions of men in the face of civil society. Considerations of constitutional law, heretofore held to mark and define the limits of political action as distinct from the sphere of moral or social reform, have ceased to be held of binding force under the pressure of revolutionary ideas, which contemplate not only a defensive war against armed insurgents, but an aggressive war against the domestic institution of slavery as it exists in the Loyal Slaveholding and in the Insurgent States. For those who take this view of the war are not more determined on the extinction of slavery in Arkansas or Louisiana than in Maryland or Kentucky, and their processes to this end in the former State equal with the latter are made part and parcel of the military policy of the nation—the President's scheme of emancipation with compensation to loyal owners, having been postponed by his political friends for that which looks to the bloody extermination of slavery in some States and its destruction in others by the attrition of military force acting upon it directly, as in Maryland, or more indirectly, as in Kentucky. The men who espouse this theory of war are for the Union only on condition that slavery shall be everywhere and immediately abolished.

To the advocates of this theory the upholders of the Constitution and all "unconditional Union men" are in necessary opposition. This opposition does not necessarily grow at all out of any "love for slavery," though President Lincoln has recorded his opinion that a man may be for the Union, but not without slavery, and yet be a good Union man—a proposition which does not comport with our idea of an unconditional friend of our Union. As we understand the matter, a true friend of the Union conditions his support of the Constitution, and of the Government defined by the Constitution, on no policy which looks to either the preservation or destruction of slavery as being paramount to the political duties enjoined by that Constitution. A man may fervently desire the extinction of slavery in every State of the Union, and yet, precisely in proportion to his intelligent appreciation of this desiderated end, may be his inevitable repugnance to the agencies now invoked for its forcible extermination. Such a man may see, or think that he sees, in a policy like this, the inversion of fundamental ideas belonging to the whole theory of civil government and moral reform. *Non tali auxilio* is the reply with which the conscientious philanthropist equally with the enlightened statesman may repel the alliance of the sword when offered to be wielded in the cause of social amelioration and moral progress. The magistrate does not bear the sword in vain or wrongfully wherever it is drawn in defence of political rights defined by the Constitution of the State, but when he carries this sword into the domain of social and moral ideas he is intruding on a province where his carnal weapons are as powerless for good as the dart of Priam. The civil government, as being ordained of God, has a right to be and to maintain its being against all who resist its lawful authority, but it is not to be crowned with honor in the maintenance of its rights unless it strive for them lawfully, respecting the limits which define its just prerogatives and infringing none of the sanctions which lie outside of its realm. It may not transgress these limits under the guise of subverting the interests of religion or philanthropy or of abstract and eternal right, for these are pure ideas which do not inhere in the civil forms of the State except as they are begotten by spiritual influences permeating the minds of men and moulding them into conformity with the pattern of things heavenly. The ideas which make the glory of our

Christian civilization are propagated only by immaterial forces. Mohammedanism adopts a different policy, and extends its conquests not so much by the inculcation of its principles as by the power of the sword, and the difference between the religion of Christ and of the False Prophet is marked by this feature of their respective systems as distinctively as by any other peculiar to each.

And yet such is the predominance of the physical over the intellectual, of the instincts of brute force over the suggestions of moral truth, that nations professing Christianity have been slow to learn the efficacy of spiritual forces as a means of reform, and have been ever prompt to exchange the weapons of more ethereal temper for those wielded by the politician and the warrior. The line that divides the political from the moral and social world is not clearly perceived, or, if perceived, is not respected in the fervor of passion that sometimes takes away the reason of a whole people. There are to-day many who suppose themselves to be "good Union men" who would not support the war for an hour except as a war against slavery. They openly avow the fact, and glory in postponing the political objects of the war to its social and moral aspects. We have seen a major general flatter himself to draw his sword in defence of the Union unless this view of duty was first conceded, and in the face of such contumacy he was rewarded with high diplomatic honors by the President and Senate.

Now, we venture to affirm that any such theory of action is equally unsound in policy and false in ethics. And in this judgment we are sustained by the most primary and fundamental principles of both the political and moral world. They who would "theorize with bayonets and dogmatize in blood" attempt the impossible if they hope by such agencies to implant and found the principles of philanthropy and freedom. They may destroy the slave system for a time by the march of our armies, but they have not eradicated slavery from its basis in the degraded condition of the slave. Is it said that the slave system must be trodden down before this root of slavery can be extirpated? The reply is easy. War is not a legitimate means of social reform in the figure of the State, and will always prove more a hindrance than a help to the true reformer and genuine philanthropist. War becomes necessary and morally defensible only when it is required to repel aggressions supported by physical force intruding on the just prerogatives of the State. Hence the war for the maintenance of the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws against the encroachments of an armed secession may be said to have been necessary and morally defensible, but it is necessary and morally defensible only as it keeps within the sanctions imposed by the Constitution and by the very nature of civil society. War for the defence of lawful Government is authorized by Scripture and by the moral polity of States. But war for the correction of social evils is an anomaly which does equal violence to the sanctions of the Divine law and to the right thinking of men as rational beings.

We are not stating new propositions in ethics or social science. The truths we propound are admitted by all enlightened philanthropists. They were inculcated by the wisdom and illustrated by the eloquence of a Channing. Let us hear what Senator Sumner has so justly said of that great thinker and writer. We quote from his oration before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Harvard University at their anniversary of August 22, 1846:

"In his defence of the liberty of the African race, he always invoked the great considerations of justice and humanity. The argument of economy, which is deemed by some minds the only argument pertinent to the subject, never presented itself to him. The question of profit and loss was absorbed in that of right and wrong. His maxim was, 'Any thing but slavery; poverty sooner than slavery.' While he exhibited this institution in the blackest colors, of reprobation, as unhuman, unjust, unchristian, unworthy of an age of light and of a republic professing freedom, his gentle soul found no word of harshness for those who birth, education, and custom have bred in its support. He was implacable towards wrong, but swift words towards wrong-doers. He looked forward to the day when they too, encompassed by a moral blockade, invisible to the eye, but more potent than armies and under the influence of increasing Christian light, diffused from all the nations, shall with righteous magnanimity acknowledge the wrong and set their captives free. 'Hereafter a just and enlightened public opinion, regarding the rights and wrongs of mankind, shall condemn both sides as wrong, shall deem all wars as fratricidal, and shall see in every battle-field a scene from which to avert the catastrophe, as from that dismal dell beneath the walls of Grecian Thebes. To hasten this condition of the public mind our philanthropist benevolently labored. 'Follow my white plume,' said the chivalrous monarch of France as he plunged into the thick of the vulgar fight. 'Follow the Right,' more resolute than prince or orator, was the watchword of Channing. With a soul that kindled at the recital of every act of unassuming virtue, of every deed of self-sacrifice in a righteous cause, his clear Christian judgment was not swayed by the vulgar light of the Right, whether in ancient thunderbolts of war or in the career of modern conquest. He saw that the fairest flowers cannot bloom in a soil moistened by human blood. He saw that to overcome evil by bullets and bayonets was less great and glorious than to overcome it by good. He saw that the courage of the camp was inferior to the Christian fortitude of patience, resignation, and forgiveness of evil—as the spirit which scourged and crucified the Saviour was less divine than that which murmured, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'"

This reflects the true spirit of the Christian reformer. It was under the influence of such a spirit that the evils of slavery melted away before the progress of the gospel in the Roman Empire. Not by might, but by power, but by the spirit of Christianity, gradually infusing itself into the masses of society, were the supports of slavery undermined and the institution finally removed. The institution itself was not attacked either by denunciatory word or violent deed of the early Christian teachers, but the reciprocal duties of men in the relations of master and slave were so enforced on each that the estate of compulsory service lost its hardships preliminary to losing its form and place in the State. This transition was not accomplished with the battles of the warrior or with garments rolled in blood; but its progress was steady and sure, because proceeding under the impulse of moral ideas slowly winning their way by the force of individual regeneration—a leaven assimilating the whole mass of society—and not by the

sporadic action of physical forces holding men in mechanical union without any congruity of spiritual nature and moral disposition.

We know there are those who now exalt the propagandism of the sword above the propagandism of Christ and his disciples. It is held "loyal" to do so, but in our eyes, it is none the less infatuated and profane for being the dialect of impiety talking in the cant of philanthropy. A distinguished member of the House of Representatives, speaking in his place in that body not long ago, held the following language, whether in derision or in earnest, we cannot say:

"The spirit of Massachusetts has done in two or three years only what Christ, or the Church of Christ, was twelve or fifteen hundred years in accomplishing in the Roman Empire."

We will let our readers choose between the spirit of Christianity, working gradually but successfully for centuries to uproot slavery by the elevating doctrines of the gospel, and the "spirit of Massachusetts," as the two are here contrasted. The two systems of reform are unlike enough, but, at the risk of being counted "slow," we must decline to give the precedence to the latter, whether regard be had to the agencies used or the results produced. The effect of these "three years'" fighting against slavery, in the name of fighting for the Union, is thus generalized by one of the most martial of our clergymen. We quote from a sermon delivered by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher only last Sunday:

"We know that within the lines of the rebel army there are three million slaves. As yet we learn they are amenable to the will of their masters, patient, and docile. This state of things exists where war and its devastations surround them, where indomitable, civil and military, are held out to them; what, then, will be the fact, when peace is come and war is at an end? Do you suppose there is less of lust, less of avarice, less of avarice in the South than there was before the war? Lust, avarice, and laziness are the basis on which slavery has ever rested. Will not the value of the slave be as great as ever as an article of commerce? Can he not pick cotton and sugar-cane and grow corn as well as ever? Don't be deceived. Slavery is not dead. You may cut a wisp of straw with a sword, and the head will creep off one way, but who will without caution approach the tail of the wisp? You may cut slavery in two with a sword, but so long as it is virtually existing its sting is there. The only way to kill a wisp is to m-m-m-m it, and the only way to kill slavery is to grind it to political powder."

Christ and his apostles thought there was a more excellent way than this by which to remove social evils. Mr. Beecher undoubtedly is wiser than they. We do not exclude all war from either our theology or our philosophy, but we do most entirely exclude war from the theology or philosophy of philanthropic reform. The idea of such means to such an end seems to us the "very error of the moon," as we read the history of human amelioration, and as we understand the law of moral progress.

We do not state these views in any expectation that they will influence the minds of men who are heated with the passionate strifes of the hour. Such persons are all aglow with a phrensy which dazes their reason. The light that leads some of them astray is all the more delusive for seeming in their eyes to be light from heaven. They suppose themselves to be fighting "God's battle" while aware that they are using carnal weapons, and that He asks not such aid to promote the cause of the right in a field where moral forces are the only true agencies of reform. In such a fight they who use the sword out of its proper place and sphere may well fear lest they find it whetted with the Divine malediction which proclaims that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword, while the hopes of social reform built on hecatombs of the slain will prove as illusory in fact as they are unsound in theory. The sword rightfully vindicates the cause of political law and order, but those who wield it outside of this its appropriate sphere are doomed to hold it by the blade and not by the handle.

We are well aware of the taunt with which it is common to repel such considerations as these. They signify, it is said, that "slavery is too sacred to be touched by the rude hand of war." "You may kill a rebel, but you must not disturb the divine institution of slavery." Where this reply springs from fanaticism it is of course beyond the reach of argument. But, as there may be some who hold this language in sincerity from a want of sufficient perspicacity to apprehend the real purport and bearing of the views we have announced, it may be proper to state the position of rational and unconditional friends of the Union on this point.

We have to say, then, that such men's "loyalty" does not turn on conditions looking primarily any more to the preservation than the destruction of slavery. They hold that war is an agency which can be lawfully invoked only for the attainment of political objects falling within the scope of civil government. A defensive war, waged for the preservation of the Constitution and laws, is a war which may be rightful and expedient. And in a war so waged it may be a part of the Providential necessities accompanying it that moral ends shall be subserved and social reforms precipitated by its progress. But when man deliberately steps outside of the province and sphere of his action, and rashly or blindly presumes to translate the counsels of Heaven by identifying them with bloody schemes of social renovation, he shows that he is grossly ignorant of the laws which regulate the civil polity of States and the moral government of the Universe. He then transgresses his authority, and by so transgressing it brings confusion on his well-meant schemes and overthrow to the hopes of all.

We believe that slavery is destined to pass away from the United States and from the face of the whole earth. The institution has always and every where marked a transition state of society. Slavery is born of the degradation engendered by evil passions and animal appetites disqualifying for freedom. And the fearful conflict joined in our country over the matter of slavery has sprung from antagonisms founded on equally inadequate views of this social institution. In the South there were those who, for years, bent all their zeal to the in-

culcation of the dogma that slavery was not only the natural and normal condition of the negro in his present moral and intellectual condition, but that this status was so beneficent and wholesome that it ought to be indefinitely perpetuated in time and extended in space. At the North there were those who saw in this grievous estate of the African a national sin and wrong which filled their souls with pity for the slave and deep hatred for the slaveholder. These opposite passions soon lent themselves to the aspirations and strifes of political ambition on both sides, until in the end the bitterness of wrath and evil speaking has broken out in a civil war of unexampled proportions. Both sides, in their representative men, were eager for the horrid fray. They hailed it with undisciplined exultations. They each sought to precipitate its bloody issue. The result is before us. But whoso these things will grow before the issue of blood is stanchd no man knows. Launched as we are on a stormy sea, the sport of Titanic forces which no man can tame or restrain, we shall drift at the mercy of the winds and waves evoked by our tempestuous passions until both sides shall learn to practise the wisdom and righteousness which exalt a nation. And if the great historian of heathenism could warn the degenerate Romans that the gods in their justice "consulted for the punishment as well as the security of nations," shall the Christian mind of this country be insensible to the warning suggested by the righteous government of Him to whom vengeance belongs? *Nec enim unquam atrocioribus Populi Romani claudibus, magisve justis indicibus, approbata est non esse curae Deus securitatem nostram, esse ultionem.* Such were the awful words which Tacitus placed at the very threshold of his narrative when he was about to retrace "the footprints of dying liberty" to Rome. Shall a Christian people be careless to mark the meaning of the terrible chastisements that still afflict our land?

## IMPORTANT FINANCIAL MATTERS.

Mr. Secretary CHASE, it is understood, is making arrangements for the issue of gold notes, receivable for duties, which he proposes to pay for the interest falling due on April 1, May 1, July 1, August 1, October 1, November 1, 1864, and January 1, 1865, without rebate on interest due on or before July 1, and with rebate at the rate of three per cent. per annum on interest due after that date. The aggregate of interest coming due at these dates is about \$45,000,000, of which it is supposed that about \$25,000,000 will be anticipated in this way, making a virtual addition of nearly that amount to the stock of gold. The Secretary also has under consideration the expediency of receiving national currency at rates slightly below the current value of gold and of issuing therefor Assistant Treasurer's certificates receivable in payment of duties.

## THE ESCAPE OF JOHN MORGAN.

The committee appointed by the Ohio House of Representatives to investigate the escape of John Morgan and party from the penitentiary have just reported. They find that the prisoners had no aid, and that none was required, since the escape could not have occurred if the chamber under the cell had not existed. They place all the blame on the military authorities for not making a regular examination of the cell, and recommend hereafter that all prisoners confined in the penitentiary be under the control of the warden.

## DEATH OF THE HON. OWEN LOVEJOY.

OWEN LOVEJOY, the member of Congress from the Fifth Illinois district, died in Brooklyn, (N. Y.) at half-past eleven o'clock on Friday night. He had been complaining since last January, but came to New York from Washington on the 15th, and the following day was out of doors; since then he has been confined to his bed with an affection of the liver and kidneys. He was attended in his last illness by his wife and daughter, and by many sympathizing friends.—*Evening Post.*

## REPORTS FROM MEXICO.

The New Orleans Herald of the 18th instant has a letter from San Luis Potosi stating that Gen. Alvarado had been captured by the Liberal Mexican forces under Gen. Urquiza, by which twenty-four cannon and seven hundred prisoners, French and Mexican, fell into possession of the forces of Juarez; also, that Puebla is besieged by the Liberals and must fall. The Picayune of the 19th decredites both reports.

## ANOTHER JAPANESE EMBASSY.

We learn by a Shanghai paper of the 25th of January that several Japanese ambassadors from Japan had arrived at that port en route to Europe. The object of their mission is said to be to confer with the European Governments on the question of abolishing the treaty which opens the port of Yokohama to foreigners, the Japanese Government maintaining that such treaty was only entered into by way of experiment, and that the experiment had failed. The Treaty desires that foreigners should be limited to the two ports of Hakodadi and Nagasaki.

## CONFEDERATE BILLS AND NOTES.

An order has just been issued from the War Department which reads thus: "All Confederate bills, notes, or bonds in the hands of officers or agents of the Government will be transmitted to the Adjutant General of the Army, with a specified statement how and from whom they were received. If captured, the circumstances of the capture will be stated; and if any portion has been expended, the amount and mode of expenditure will be given. Commanding officers of departments, armies in the field, independent posts, regiments, and companies are charged with the execution of this order."

The Marlboro' (Md.) Prince Georgian says: "We have the pleasure to express the great gratification with which the community has learned that, through the personal interposition of President Lincoln, Mrs. WARING, wife of Col. John Henry Waring, has been released from exile and allowed to return to Maryland, and that there is a prospect that the Colonel's property will also be restored to him."

Brig. Gen. DAVID B. BIRNEY, U. S. Volunteers, has been confirmed as a Major General in the volunteer service, his commission to date from May 20, 1863.

Gen. WM. F. SMITH was on Wednesday confirmed by the Senate as Major General.

Major JOHN HAY, the President's assistant private secretary, returned to Washington yesterday from his recent mission to Florida.

The United States steamer Powhatan, Commander Ronckenhoff, arrived at St. Thomas February 19, and left again on the 18th on a cruise.

THE "FRENCH BROTHERS"—a Bishop Titian, of Buffalo announces officially that the French Brothers cannot march in procession with Catholic societies, nor take part in Catholic rites and holy sacrifices.

## CONGRESSIONAL.

### PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE.

#### Extracts from Our Daily Reports.

#### GOVERNMENT TRANSPORTATION OF VOTERS.

Mr. KERNAN, of New York, asked unanimous consent to submit a resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee of five members, to be appointed by the Speaker, to investigate and report to the House whether the employment of the Government in the transportation of voters to and from the polls in the State elections was a violation of the laws of the United States; and whether the transportation home and back was paid at their own expense or that of the Government; and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers, and employ a clerk, and have leave to report at any time.

Mr. STEVENS, of Pennsylvania, suggested that the Committee on the Conduct of the War conduct the investigation.

Mr. KERNAN would not consent to this, and so the resolution was not introduced.

#### CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE MILLER DISMISSED.

On motion of Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the memorial asking for the impeachment of Judge Miller of that State. He remarked that the case had been carefully considered by the committee, and that, after examining all the documents and records, they failed to discover any fact upon which an impeachment could be based.

#### PERSONAL MATTERS.

Mr. McCLURG, of Missouri, rose to a question of order, and obtained unanimous consent to make a statement. He alluded to the speech which he made on the 9th instant, in which he charged his colleague (Mr. BLAIR) with having issued an order, while in military command, for suppressing the colored army contrary to the trade regulations of the Treasury Department. He said that, at that time, he expressed his surprise that he (Mr. McCLURG) had not seen the denial of the order and invoice as forgeries. He alluded to his colleague's time to furnish the proof of forgery, which had been produced, and could be produced. There was a Latin maxim, which, being translated, was false in one false in all. Therefore, one falsehood of a witness being exposed, the whole testimony should be rejected as worthless. His colleague (Mr. Blair) had appeared before his own committee, and had expounded his colleague's falsehood and duplicity, and infidelity to the radicals in his statements to the President. On the same day, his colleague denied that persons of color had been run off from Missouri and sold to other States. In proof of this fact, Mr. McCLURG produced an order from Gen. Rosecrans, dated St. Louis, March 1, 1864, in which the transportation of such persons is prohibited, as even free persons had been sold in distress, and his colleague "light well be embarrassed."

He would give such relief as is extended to criminals after the sentence of condemnation. He then produced a letter from Mr. Conner, special agent of the Treasury Department, to Mr. Blair, dated March 1, 1864, concerning the alleged forgery, and charging Mr. Blair with willful and malicious falsehood.

The SPEAKER promptly called the gentleman to order for having violated the rules of order and decorum of the House.

Mr. McCLURG, resuming, said his colleague had branded the liquor order as a forgery. Now he had had that order photographed, and copies of it could be produced by those who desire them. Here it was. Justice must be done, though anguish were caused to the friends of the condemned.

Mr. BLAIR asked that a select committee be appointed to investigate the charge made by his colleague, and said "I pronounce my colleague's allegation a base and willful falsehood, and I pronounce him an infamous liar and a scoundrel."

The SPEAKER called Mr. BLAIR to order for a violation of the rules, and expressed the hope that the House would not be divided on the question of the rules.

Mr. BLAIR, I could not be any other language to an allegation so false and utterly contemptible. I ask for a special committee to send for persons and papers. If I am guilty I am not fit to be a Representative. The guilt will be on those who have caused the charge.

The SPEAKER requested the gentleman to reduce his resolution to writing.

Mr. McCLURG said he now had before him papers purporting to be written by some of his colleague's staff, which he should be much pleased to lay before the committee.

Addressing himself to Mr. BLAIR, and holding out in his hand a paper, he asked, "You will not deny this signature?"

Mr. BLAIR, I will not reply to a question from such a source as that.

The SPEAKER again called the gentleman to order for a violation of the rules.

Mr. J. C. ALLEN thought there was no necessity for debate, and that the subject should be referred to a committee.

Mr. McCLURG again asked permission to send certain original documents to the committee.

Mr. BLAIR then offered a resolution, in writing, that a select committee of three members be appointed by the Speaker, with power to send for persons and papers, and investigate the charge of J. W. Clurg, of Missouri, against Francis P. Blair, Jr., of the said State, of a violation of the laws in the matter of an alleged liquor speculation.

Mr. STEVENS suggested an amendment, adding that the committee also inquire into the genuineness or falsity of the documents which have been produced.

The resolution, as thus amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed Messrs. HENRY, of California, CLAY, of Kentucky, and PRYOR, of New York, the said committee.

#### NATIONAL BANKS.

The special order was then taken up, namely, the bill amendatory of the National Bank act.

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts, remarked that this bill made such corrections as time and experience provided for, and that it was a good law so perfect that the State banks may organize under it, instead of continuing under their State charters. He looked on the system of State banks as having outlived their day, and as being unequal to the present exigencies of the country.

Mr. HOOPER said in his explanation of the principles of the bill, the national banks had worked well, and he expressed the hope that all gentlemen would give their support to a measure which had been so carefully matured.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the bill, and resumed the consideration of the bill amendatory of the national bank law.

Mr. BROOKS, of New York, contended that the bill was a measure which could be brought before Congress, desired it should be amended to make it as acceptable as possible, or, at all events, to make it work smoothly.

Instead of there being a bureau on currency connected with the Treasury, there should be a separate Department, located at New York, and not in Washington, with a Comptroller at eight hundred dollars annually, to be in office for four years. He offered an amendment for this purpose, but it was rejected.

Mr. BROOKS asked that the National Bank bill be postponed until Monday, with a view to give the representatives of the Clearing House an opportunity of being heard on this important measure.

Mr. DAVIS, of New York, also briefly advocated the suggestion.

Mr. STEVENS said this bill had been before the country ten days. Gentlemen representing financial interests had been heard on it, and some of them had been heard before the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HOOPER remarked that Messrs. Lyman and Galatin were present before the committee, and had suggested amendments, most of which, being judicious, were adopted. The committee, however, did not assent to locating the bureau in New York.

Mr. STEVENS would not consent to postponement, and insisted on his motion; previously offered, that general debate should cease in five minutes.

This motion was decided in the affirmative by the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS endeavored to have the question decided by yeas and nays, but the Speaker ruled that he was too late in making the motion. He then called the yeas and nays, and the bill was passed.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the bill amendatory of the National Bank act, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the memorial asking for the impeachment of Judge Miller of that State.

Mr. MOOREHEAD held that the rebellion is not a new thing in American history. It was commenced in 1853 against an existing law, but the last outbreak occurred at the time when harmony existed throughout the country, and was altogether unjustifiable, as admitted even by some of the prominent leaders in the rebellion on their own terms. It was a premeditated, infamous, and wicked attempt to destroy the Union and free government, and establish a despotism on the ruins, with the aid of European intrigue. The man who, in a loyal State, sympathizes with it, would, in revolutionary times, be called a traitor, and by deprecating the power of the Government to destroy the rebellion would be an enemy of the country.

He rejoiced in the progress of our arms, and anticipated the day when the false friends of the Union will be assigned to deserved infamy. He said that the President of the United States had discharged his duties with a scrupulous regard to public and private honor, and has not violated his sacred obligations; and for these and other reasons the people demand his re-election. Proclamations of emancipation are not alone sufficient. We should resort to legal action to make the destruction of slavery complete, and that there should be an amendment of the Constitution. He spoke of our financial success as the wonder of the world, and said that our country will become the favored spot of all the earth and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, where merit and honest labor will receive their full reward.

Mr. HERRICK arraigned the Administration for an intention to prolong the war with a view of prolonging its power. If the object had been a restoration of the Union the rebellion would have been secured long ago; and, failing to do so, it is guilty of moral treason. He said that more was to be expected from the ballot-box than from the army, and that the Democracy were in favor of ending the war as soon as possible, compatible with honor.

Mr. ECKLEY revisited the condition and progress of the rebellion and the political influence which produced it, and he alluded to the great resources of the country as sufficient to prosecute it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. HARRINGTON arraigned the Administration with having violated their sacred obligations, and oppression of a generous and confiding people.

Mr. HARDING charged the Administration with violating its pledges and furnishing evidence of their own duplicity; and then proceeded to vindicate the institution of slavery, and to show that no right existed in the President to disturb it.

The committee rose, and at half-past four o'clock the House adjourned.

by yeas and nays, but the Speaker ruled that he was too late in making the motion. He then called the yeas and nays, and the bill was passed.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the bill amendatory of the National Bank act, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the memorial asking for the impeachment of Judge Miller of that State.

Mr. MOOREHEAD held that the rebellion is not a new thing in American history. It was commenced in 1853 against an existing law, but the last outbreak occurred at the time when harmony existed throughout the country, and was altogether unjustifiable, as admitted even by some of the prominent leaders in the rebellion on their own terms. It was a premeditated, infamous, and wicked attempt to destroy the Union and free government, and establish a despotism on the ruins, with the aid of European intrigue. The man who, in a loyal State, sympathizes with it, would, in revolutionary times, be called a traitor, and by deprecating the power of the Government to destroy the rebellion would be an enemy of the country.

He rejoiced in the progress of our arms, and anticipated the day when the false friends of the Union will be assigned to deserved infamy. He said that the President of the United States had discharged his duties with a scrupulous regard to public and private honor, and has not violated his sacred obligations; and for these and other reasons the people demand his re-election. Proclamations of emancipation are not alone sufficient. We should resort to legal action to make the destruction of slavery complete, and that there should be an amendment of the Constitution. He spoke of our financial success as the wonder of the world, and said that our country will become the favored spot of all the earth and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, where merit and honest labor will receive their full reward.

Mr. HERRICK arraigned the Administration for an intention to prolong the war with a view of prolonging its power. If the object had been a restoration of the Union the rebellion would have been secured long ago; and, failing to do so, it is guilty of moral treason. He said that more was to be expected from the ballot-box than from the army, and that the Democracy were in favor of ending the war as soon as possible, compatible with honor.

Mr. ECKLEY revisited the condition and progress of the rebellion and the political influence which produced it, and he alluded to the great resources of the country as sufficient to prosecute it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. HARRINGTON arraigned the Administration with having violated their sacred obligations, and oppression of a generous and confiding people.

Mr. HARDING charged the Administration with violating its pledges and furnishing evidence of their own duplicity; and then proceeded to vindicate the institution of slavery, and to show that no right existed in the President to disturb it.

The committee rose, and at half-past four o'clock the House adjourned.

by yeas and nays, but the Speaker ruled that he was too late in making the motion. He then called the yeas and nays, and the bill was passed.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the bill amendatory of the National Bank act, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the memorial asking for the impeachment of Judge Miller of that State.

Mr. MOOREHEAD held that the rebellion is not a new thing in American history. It was commenced in 1853 against an existing law, but the last outbreak occurred at the time when harmony existed throughout the country, and was altogether unjustifiable, as admitted even by some of the prominent leaders in the rebellion on their own terms. It was a premeditated, infamous, and wicked attempt to destroy the Union and free government, and establish a despotism on the ruins, with the aid of European intrigue. The man who, in a loyal State, sympathizes with it, would, in revolutionary times, be called a traitor, and by deprecating the power of the Government to destroy the rebellion would be an enemy of the country.

He rejoiced in the progress of our arms, and anticipated the day when the false friends of the Union will be assigned to deserved infamy. He said that the President of the United States had discharged his duties with a scrupulous regard to public and private honor, and has not violated his sacred obligations; and for these and other reasons the people demand his re-election. Proclamations of emancipation are not alone sufficient. We should resort to legal action to make the destruction of slavery complete, and that there should be an amendment of the Constitution. He spoke of our financial success as